Dear Les, 10/13/76

By way of explaining the enclosed letter to Jim on the call from the House committee's chief counsel I should add that when asked about him by one of his local Phila. papers I raised legit. questions of conflict of interest but said he has a fine record as a prosecutor, which is excellent qualification for the counsel's job. I also laid out a tough approach for the balance of this session, aimed at establishing need and credibility and limited to that, then with the basic evidence relating to the homicide only. I'm sure he knows of both. He made no reference to either. I take that as possibly a good sign.

Sprague is a tough prosecutor. I think he'll have learned about buttered bread and sides of it.

We'll see.

As you'll see, I believe you should be heard of the King stuff. It may not be possible before you leave.

With copies of your stories I can fill some of this in sort of in your name and as your work in personal meetings with Sprague. However, it would be good to have something in writing from you covering what followed your stories, particularly what Redditt told you of the falsity of the Lane/Mann approach to him.

My purposes here are not to raise questions about the Lane/Mann ethics, although that will be one effect. Rather do I want to address their credibility and the dependability of what they present as their own.

If we can't cut them off at the pass we may circle the wagons in vain.

Besides, they are not real red men. They have painted faces.

And we have white hats, don't we? (Shades of Malcolm X!)

However, if I have this material in writing from you I may have a later use for it and I will have it if they cannot hear you before you leave. This will be better than what committees can accept, hearsay.

It will also serve to lay a basis for later public testomony, should they want it (as they indeed should) and for immobilizing the members of less than purity in present purposes, the silent ones.

Hastily,